DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 833 HE 024 692

AUTHOR Mohapatra, Manindra K.; And Others
TITLE Indiana Public Administrators and the Teaching of Public Administration: Some Empirical Findings.
INSTITUTION Indiana State Univ., Terre Haute. Center for Governmental Services.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the National Teaching Public Administration Conference (14th, Knoxville, TN, February 20-23, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Education; *Course Content; Educational Needs; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Professional Education; *Public Administration Education; Responses; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Indiana

ABSTRACT

A fall 1990 mail survey of 1,000 Indiana public administrators (500 state, 500 local) was carried out by the Center for Governmental Services at Indiana State University. The survey sought to identify the aggregate and individual views of these incumbent public administrators concerning issues of import to the teaching of public administration at the graduate level. A total of 240 usable questionnaires were received. Nearly 54.4% of the respondents indicated familiarity with professional degree programs in public administration offered by Indiana universities. These administrators designated the following order of importance among the fields of knowledge that are included in Master of Public Administration (MPA) programs: organizational behavior and interpersonal relations (82%); budget operations and financial administration (77%); personnel management (70%); public relations/communication (67%); management information systems and computer utilization (52%); policy analysis (42%); administrative law and legal issues (42%); program evaluation research methodology (24%); and statistical analysis (16%). The respondents also recommended membership in various professional organizations for MPA students. Contains 13 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333833

INDIANA PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS AND THE TEACHING OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: SOME EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A RESEARCH REPORT FROM

THE CENTER FOR GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
TERRE HAUTE, INDIANA 47809 (USA)
PHONE: (812) 237-2430

HE024692

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

INDIANA STATE UNIV

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INDIANA PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS AND THE TEACHING OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: SOME EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

by

Manindra K. Mohapatra
Professor of Political Science and
Director, MPA Program;
Director, Center for Governmental Services

James L. McDowell
Professor of Political Science and
Faculty Research Associate,
Center for Governmental Services

R. Christopher Perry
Associate Professor of Political Science and
Faculty Research Associate,
Center for Governmental Services

Shamima Ahmed
Adjunct Faculty in Political Science and
Faculty Research Associate,
Center for Governmental Services

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Terre Haute, IN 47809

* The data analyses, conclusions and recommendations included in this research report are those of the authors.

EXCERPTED FROM

Proceedings of the

14th National Teaching Public Administration Conference

Knoxville, Tennessee

February 20-23, 1991

ASPA

Advancing excellence in public service

EAST TENNESSEE CHAPTER

INDIANA PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS AND THE TEACHING OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: SOME EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Manindra K. Mohapatra
Professor of Political Science and
Director, MPA Program;
Director, Center for Governmental Services

James L. McDowell
Professor of Political Science and
Faculty Research Associate,
Center for Governmental Services

R. Christopher Perry
Associate Professor of Political Science and
Faculty Research Associate,
Center for Governmental Services

Shamima Ahmed
Adjunct Faculty in Political Science and
Faculty Research Associate,
Center for Governmental Services
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Terre Haute, IN 47809[1]

ABSTRACT

A Fall 1990 mail survey of 1000 Indiana public administrators (500 state, 500 local) was carried out by the Center for Governmental Services at Indiana State University. The survey sought to identify the views of these incumbent public administrators toward issues affecting Master of Public Administration degree programs.

A total of 240 usable questionnaires arrived at the Center by December 1, 1990, for a return rate of 24%. Selected collective attributes of the respondents include: Male (76%), Whites (86%), College Educated (88.3%), Graduate degree recipients (48%), MPA degree recipients (12%), State agency officials (58%), elected officials (26%).

Nearly 54.4% of the respondents indicated familiarity with professional degree programs in public administration offered by Indiana universities. These administrators designated the following ordering of importance among the fields of knowledge that are included in MPA programs: organizational behavior and interpersonal relations (82%); budget operations and financial administration (77%); personnel management (70%); public relations/communication (67%); political institutions and processes in state/local governments (67%); management information systems and computer utilization (52%); policy analysis (42%); administrative law and legal issues (42%), program evaluation research methodology (24%); and statistical analysis (16%). The respondents also recommended membership in various professional organizations for MPA students.

Open-ended suggestions--solicited by the survey instrument--were provided by about 50 of the 240 respondents. These suggestions have potential for improving MPA program offerings, and are discussed in the present report.

INTRODUCTION

Public administration is an established profession, with a university-based training structure which has achieved its own influence on governance (see Mosher, 1982; Becker, 1962). Public administration as a field of university study is marked by the existence and growth of specialized schools (or programs located in larger types of structures). Such schools/programs can both influence and be nurtured by the professional socialization of in-service public administrators and those pre-service "generalist" students who are aspiring to become public administrators.

If the influential "edge" of the profession is to be maintained and renewed, the faculty who are involved with the instructional programs in these schools have a special obligation to maintain a continuing linkage between the schools and the profession. Just as one reason for the establishment of professional graduate degree programs is to respond to the personnel needs of related professions, another reason for such programs is to maintain and renew this linkage.

A wide variety of mechanisms may be utilized in connection with the above concern. Examples are advisory committees, a mentor system, utilization of qualified professionals as classroom teachers in professional courses, and membership in professional societies. The present research project may be thought of as a direct version of still another method--a direct probing for the weight of aggregate and individual views of practicing public administrators concerning issues of import to the teaching of public administration at the graduate level. The study thus follows the path of other researchers who have attempted, through systematic research, to relate the world of public service practitioners to the teaching of public administration (see Chauhan, 1981; Drew, 1984; Grode and Holzer, 1975; Henry, 1978).

STUDY OBJECTIVES

This study was conducted in connection with a program development plan for the Master of Public Administration (MPA) program at Indiana State University. The most specific objective of this research was to explore answers to a series of questions relating to that institution's present and prospective MPA program elements. These emerged as follows:

1. How familiar are state/local administrators in Indiana with the MPA programs in the state?
2. At these administrators' agency workplaces, what is the level of interest in graduate education in public administration?
3. What factors motivate public administrators in Indiana to pursue graduate programs in public administration?
4. Which fields of knowledge generally covered in MPA programs are considered by these administrators as important?
5. Which elements of the political environment of public administration are perceived as important by these administrators?
6. Which professional organization affiliations are considered by these public administrators as beneficial?
7. Which areas of continuing education are considered by these administrators as important?
8. What are some other views of these public administrators about the structure and delivery of MPA programs in Indiana?

The present survey instrument was distributed and returned during Fall 1990. Because this is a single state study, its findings may or may not be more generally applicable. (A recent and comparable research effort suggests that the findings of this Indiana survey are consistent with patterns observed in Kentucky (Mohapatra et al, 1990b).) Still, it is the case that specific findings suggest that other sorts of research objectives--those of a more theoretical nature--might be appropriate. At any rate, this working paper may, in effect, add to an empirical data base which could be quite directly useful for faculty members in Indiana and elsewhere.

Scholars may wish to make further comparisons with other studies of a temporally and geographically more distant nature (Abney and Leuth, 1982; Bowman, 1990; Carson and Roeder, 1990; Grode and Holzer, 1975; Nigro and Demarco, 1979). Some of these studies have analyzed the responses of MPA program participants such as currently enrolled MPA students (Henry, 1978). By contrast, the present study analyzes the perspectives of public administrators, most of whom are neither P.A.-related degree holders nor are currently enrolled in any MPA program. That this makes some difference is a theme explored (however briefly) below.

Methodology

SAMPLE--DATA SOURCES

Two major nationally published source lists of Indiana state and local (city/county) administrators were obtained (Carroll Publishing Company, State Executive Directory, 1990b; Municipal/County Executive Directory, 1990a). A random sample of 500 state administrators and 500 local administrators was drawn from each of these two lists. These two source lists were up to date and did include only higher-level public administrators in state and local governments. In this respect, this sample of public administrators differs from 1990 Kentucky survey data (Mohapatra et al, 1990a) which was obtained through a random sample of all public managers in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire used in the survey was adapted from a larger instrument used in an NSF-supported research project in the School of Public Affairs, Kentucky State University (Mohapatra et al, 1990a). The instrument includes both open and closed ended items and a minimal number of questions about the background attributes of the survey participants. The questionnaire emphasized the importance of open-ended responses by providing several opportunities (including a full closing page) for them. About 50 of the respondents did provide comments; these are, at least in the aggregate, worth regarding as one of the fruits of the study, and they are summarized elsewhere in the paper.

RESPONSE RATE

At this stage a total of 240 usable responses have been coded and included for analysis. The response rate of 24% is consistent with a previous specialized survey of State administrators (the Kentucky study had a response rate of 50% with three different mailings with a questionnaire included in each mailing).

The use of only one mailing was a conscious choice; we sought the opinions of those who felt qualified and were willing to respond to this questionnaire. Secondly, Indiana State University is in the process of making programmatic changes in its MPA program by Fall 1990, suggesting the need of rapid dissemination of preliminary data from this survey for programmatic revisions. Stamped return envelopes were included as these envelopes tend to produce a better response rate than business reply envelopes. Even though the questionnaire responses were anonymous, a number of respondents volunteered their names and addresses for contact if the school needed additional information. Results on some of the "profile" variables (Table One, following text) will serve to alert the reader that most respondents are high-level and/or experienced practitioners.

A GENERAL PROFILE OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

The portions of Table One, taken together, give a general profile of the survey respondents. The majority of these administrators were men (76.5%), whites (86.5%), state administrators (58.7%), supervising eight or more persons (54.4%), and with long tenure in government (70% reported more than 10 years service). An overwhelming majority of these people are college educated (48% with Master's or higher degrees).

Given the above, it is interesting that only a small percentage had been exposed to public administration education (72% reported no public administration education). This does not mean that more recent professional background was absent; nearly 51% reported membership in a professional organization for public administrators. Nearly 25% of the respondents held elective positions and 23% self-described themselves a political appointees. Nearly 23% described themselves as merit system appointees while about 27% considered the nature of their present appointment as "other," at least in terms of the survey's categories. (Indiana has a "non-merit" category, which many volunteered as their answer.) It was the expectation of this survey that all of the participants would hold supervisory positions; this seems to have

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

been true in almost all cases. (Data on number supervised--as on other variables--are in Table One, following the text.)

The individuals who had reported having MPA degrees had earned their degrees from one of the following eight universities:

Indiana University
Purdue University
Harvard University
Indiana State University
Ball State University
Webster University
University of Michigan
California State University

Other respondents did not specify universities. Additional data (Table Two) indicate that only very few of the respondents (7.9%) reported great familiarity with public administration degree programs in Indiana. About 46% reported some familiarity, and a surprising proportion (45%) reported no familiarity.

The respondents' aggregate profile should be kept in perspective while analyzing the varied responses in this survey.

Again, these individuals are among the highest level personnel in the state and local government units in Indiana. Their expectations relating to the teaching of public administration in Indiana's university system should be useful to those of us who are preparing students for entry level positions in state and local agencies. On the other hand, their views on the teaching of public administration are likely to be influenced by their background, current position, and responsibilities. Specifically, since a majority of these respondents did not have any personal background in university-based public administration programs, the small number of those respondents who did were singled out in a portion of what follows, with an eye to uncovering variance in patterns. As we continue to refine "professionalism" and a public administration orientation--perhaps as an ordinal variable--this theme could be repeated in a reanalysis of other items.

Table Three provides a general distribution of responses to a survey item tapping what level of workplace interest perceived "close to home," in colleagues' continuing graduate education in Public Administration. Nearly 47% reported that "very few" were interested in continuing education. A comparative analysis of men and women suggests slightly lower level of interest as perceived by the women administrators. A comparison across "length of service" variable shows a great majority (68%) of those administrators with 6-10 years service perceived "very few" colleagues with an interest in continuing education, while more veteran administrators saw very few (41.5%) in the "very few" category.

Table Four provides a list of ten of the often-recognized areas of public administration knowledge, and the degree to which they were affirmed as important by these Indiana public administrators (for comparative data on Kentucky, see Mohapatra et. al., 1990b). Organizational behavior and interpersonal relations had the highest ranking (82.0%); the lowest was statistics (16.8%). Among the other fields of knowledge these recorded highest ranking by the administrators were Budgeting (77%), Personnel (70%), Public Relations (67%), Knowledge of Political Institutions and Processes (67%), and MIS/Computers (52%). Below these fields are Policy Analysis (42%), Administrative Law (42%), Program Evaluation Research Methodology (24%), and Statistical Analysis (16%).

Another important aspect of Table 4 is a comparison of what seem to be our "P.A."-backgrounded respondents with those who are "not P.A." While we could probably tune up this variable by reference to other data in the survey, and while we think there was some misunderstanding of what constitutes a P.A. education in undergraduate years, our first run on these data shows large "course preference" differences between those 65 coded as P.A. and those 167 coded otherwise. Budgets, computers, policy analysis, legal issues, program

evaluation research methodology, and statistical analysis show between a 7% and a 24% greater endorsement by the P.A. people; personnel management, public relations, and political processes show slightly more support among the more "hard knocks" (or "other knocks") folks.

Immediately following this closed-ended item, an open-ended probe sought a listing of other fields. We found listed the following: Grants Administration, Planning Courses, Strategic Planning, Fund Raising, Labor Relations, Ethics, Cultural Issues, Economic Development, Operations Research, Accounting, and History/Government of Indiana. Interestingly, ISU's MPA program has either offered or arranged most of these through other Departments in past or present years; it is certainly important to keep these topics in mind.

Table Five specifically examines the degree to which each of several "environmental" aspects of a public administrator's life was perceived as important by Indiana public administrators. Knowledge of specific policy areas (Education, Environment, Economic Development, etc.) had the highest percentage of "very important" rankings (70.0%), and Foreign Affairs involving the USA has lowest rank (6.6%).[2] The importance attached to the other aspects of politics were as follows: position of interest groups on policy issues (44.7%), legislative candidates' views (42.5%), Public sector labor relations (34.1%), views of minority groups on policy issues (33.6%), general developments in the profession of public administration (30.9%), and election voting patterns (24.6%).

We again found that a preliminary comparison of "P.A." and "non-P.A." backgrounds yielded substantial differences. As many might imagine, the more purely "political" aspects were more often thought important by the non-P.A. types. We include here legislative candidates and their views and election voting patterns. (However, both P.A. and non-P.A. types were somewhat equally interested in the "position of interest groups on policy issues.") On the other hand, and again as might be expected, the "policy" and "contextual" aspects were much more often rated as important by the P.A.-educated administrators (examples: current policy issues, minority groups, foreign affairs). Additionally--and as one would expect by a self-interest model--the P.A.-educated were much more likely to note "general developments in the profession of public administration" as important. Less explicable is the substantially greater interest of the "P.A. types" for the topic of "public sector labor relations." Perhaps this should be grouped with the P.A. people's greater interest in minority group views, as another enlightened/new topic--especially in Indiana!

University-based public administration programs have begun to deliver short workshops which contribute to the professional development of public administrators. These workshops may resemble programs delivered by some public-agencies. A number of American state governments have developed these workshop-type programs for their employees (see Governmental Services Center, Commonwealth of Kentucky 1989). The present survey attempted to assess the needs for these types of workshops by the Indiana public administrator.

Table Six tabulates responses toward various possible continuing education workshops. A series of 18 workshops was listed in the questionnaire. The administrators were asked to indicate their importance. Conflict Resolution had the highest rate of check-off (53%), and power strategies for minority administrators had the lowest (10.9%). Other workshops which were perceived as important by roughly half or more of the administrators were "motivation and goal setting," "effective meetings," "problem solving," and "time management."

Membership in professional organizations has been considered important in the various professional schools. Both the faculty members and students in professional schools tend to associate themselves with these professional groups. The schools and programs delivering MPA programs also encourage affiliation with public administration groups.

One of the open-ended items in the survey questions sought the respondents' suggestions about membership in professional organizations for MPA students. This resulted in a wide list of organizations. Seven

professional organizations received the recommendation of at least five respondents. The American Society of Public Administration topped this list, closely followed by the others listed:

(At least five respondents recommended these organizations)

Organization
American Society for Public Administrators
Indiana Association of Counties/Cities
Association of Indiana Counties
International Personnel Management Association
National League of Cities
International City Management Association
American Planning Association

A number of other groups and organizations was listed by the respondents as beneficial to MPA students. This generated a long list of national, state regional and local level organizations. These have not been listed herein; in many cases, only one respondent had suggested membership in this group. Interestingly, many of these organizations were "professional" in the purest sense--i.e., relating to specific tasks that the respondent performs on the job. As many know, "public administration" is often a secondary professional affiliation for many quite professional government workers. We hope to work with these and other responses more in subsequent studies, in order to assay the various sorts of professionalism that were evident in the survey.

OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS: A THEMATIC CONTENT ANALYSIS

In all, about 50 respondents wrote in open-ended comments. Some of these comments suggested including specific courses in an MPA program. There were other comments relating to the general orientation of the program and how to make it more practical. Some suggestions were made about a flexible program delivery format. We have appended below a few major themes and quotations from the comments.

CURRICULUM RELATED SELECTED
OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS OF INDIANA
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS

1. Provide service area specific courses (e.g. environmental management, mental health, hospital administration, etc.)
2. More business-oriented courses.
3. Have a distinct relationship between education and work experience.
4. Entry level jobs require MIS, Statistics, Research, etc. Higher level jobs emphasize public relations and organizational behavior.
5. Teach judgment, decision-making, and an ability to quickly grasp issues.
6. Form a business/education partnership.

7. Emphasize accounting.
8. Provide hands on personal computer training.
9. Teach how to handle public.
10. With the advent of union teach labor relations.
11. Teach state/federal grants management.
12. Teach cross-cultural/international issues.
13. Teach history and politics of Indiana.
14. Teach fund raising (creative funds).
15. Provide a course in planning.
16. Encourage membership in ASPA.
17. Have administrators in your classrooms.
18. Such degree programs should be brought to our attention.
19. Have a module program in Indianapolis.
20. Emphasize managerial skills and less on politics.
21. Individuals should receive on-job-training after undergraduate degree, before going onto MPA.
22. Technical people need education in the managing of people.

It is important to emphasize the political dimension of public service positions, especially at the high level of public agencies. In this context, the open-ended response of an administrator given below appears as a food for thought:

"...however, most appointments or job selections seem based on political 'payoffs'. Few seem to [feel they] need training in public administration, [and this] is causing poor performance."

FURTHER DISCUSSION AND SOME CONCLUSIONS

This project surveys the orientations of high-level Indiana public administrators' views about public administration education. It reports the findings of a Fall 1990 survey of a random sample of Indiana state/local administrators who were listed in current nationally published lists of high-level administrators. They are representative of the higher levels of public bureaucracies in the state. Their views on public administration education may be important as they are likely to be making significant decisions about the hiring of public administration graduates.

Data analysis is rather preliminary at this point; some additional surveys continue to trickle in, and these will be combined with some coding revisions to both revise/modify the current report and tackle some additional subjects. In particular, we have some data on why people might undertake academic P.A. study, but these need to be confined to respondents who may realistically be thought to be in this universe. (An ambiguity in the item-set's wording contributed to the "face validity" of this probe as applied to all respondents.) A proposed codebook revision has been drafted, and work is continuing.

Nevertheless, we have seen some rough magnitudes of interest in a variety of topics, and some early subpopulation breakdowns. More to the current report's point, and at a rather institution-specific (or, possibly, state-specific) level, a series of curricular possibilities may be "teased out" of this data set, however speculatively, as follows:

First, it appears that MPA programs could try to make the state and local administrators knowledgeable about the curricular structure of their program. About 45% of the respondents reported lack of familiarity with MPA programs in Indiana. This could partly explain the survey item indicating a perceived lack of workplace interest in continuing education among nearly 47% of the respondents' colleagues. Perhaps short term workshops should be developed and made conveniently available to these public administrators; after refining the "workshops" variables in a subsequent analysis, we hope to test whether "non-P.A." and less enthusiastic settings have an interest in the workshops, at least.

Secondly, it appears that "Public Relations" is a field of knowledge that should be considered as a separate course in the MPA program, if not as a core course. The following excerpt from NASPAA standards for MPA programs

(1988: standard no. 3.23) indicates concern for developing public relations related core expertise among MPA graduates.

> --Develop in students a demonstrated ability to organize and communicate information clearly to a variety of audiences, through formats including oral presentations, written memoranda, and technical reports and statistical charts available and tables.

A review of ISU's MPA program does not suggest the availability of a course in Public Relations for the graduate student (but see Kentucky State University, 1990 catalog). However, as with other courses, there is a program available for some in another ISU Department (Communication).

Third, the low level of importance attached to program evaluation research and statistics (24% and 16%) would be surprising to the public administration educator who emphasizes methodological expertise in the MPA program. (Recall, however, that this percentage jumps considerably among "P.A."-backgrounded respondents.

More generally, the somewhat variant responses generated in this survey about educationally "non-P.A." people's orientations may carry with them programmatic suggestions. For one, P.A. programs need to get more with political institutions and processes--these are subjects seen as having importance as well as interest. Additionally, both skill-oriented and people-oriented courses and workshops received substantial support. On the flip side, most MPA programs' general preference for quantitative/technical course work may be less justified than has been thought.

One last special topic: Given the cues from the set of respondents, short workshops or courses should be of interest to academic administrators delivering MPA programs. A wide variety of institutional mechanisms may operate in the fifty states about these types of programs by the state agencies. Some of these agencies collaborate with the state universities. For example, the Governmental Services Center, a training agency of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, is located on the campus of Kentucky State University. This agency has several collaborative training and research programs with the School of Public Affairs, Kentucky State University. Others have sought academic credits for their courses. An MPA education might consider involvement with such programs in many different ways.

TABLE ONE
PROFILE OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS (n=230)

I. GENDER --	Male	76.5%	(176)			
	Female	23.5	(54)			
II. ETHNICITY --	White	86.5%	(199)			
	Nonwhite	13.5	(31)			
III. YRS. GOV'T SERVICE --	L.t. 5 yr.	14.6%	(33)			
	6-10 yr.			16.4	(37)	
	11-15 yr.			23.9	(54)	
	16-20 yr.			22.6	(51)	
	20+ yr.			22.6	(51)	
IV. NUMBER SUPERVISED --	3 or fewer	26.1%	(59)			
	4-7			19.5	(44)	
	8-10			12.8	(29)	
	10+			41.6	(94)	
V. LEVEL OF AGENCY --	State	58.7%	(122)			
	Local	37.0	(77)			
	Other	4.3	(9)			
VI. NATURE OF JOB --	Elected Official	25.9%	(59)			
	Pol. Appointment			23.2	(53)	
	Merit System			23.7	(54)	
	Other			27.2	(62)	
VII. LEVEL OF GEN. ED.	Ph.D./JD/MD	15.2%	(35)			
	Master's			33.0	(76)	
	Bachelor's			36.1	(83)	
	High School (+)			11.7	(27)	
	Unspecified			3.9	(9)	
VIII. LEVEL OF P.A. ED.	Ph.D./DPA			2.6%	(6)	
	MPA			12.1	(28)	
	Bachelor's			7.0	(16)	
	Other (w'shop, etc.)			5.7		(13)
	None reported			72.6		(167)
IX. REPORTED PROF'N'L MEMBERSHIPS	One or more	51.7%	(119)			
	None			48.2		(111)

TABLE TWO

INDIANA ADMINISTRATORS' FAMILIARITY WITH PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION DEGREE PROGRAM IN INDIANA *

RESPONSE	ALL RESPONDENTS N = 228	ELECTED OFFICIALS N = 59	OTHER OFFICIALS N = 169
Quite familiar	7.9% (18)	6.8% (4)	8.3% (14)
Somewhat familiar	46.5% (106)	45.8% (27)	46.7% (79)
Not familiar	45.6% (104)	47.5% (28)	45.0% (76)
Total	100.0% (228)	100.0% (59)	100.0% (169)

* Based on response to the survey question: "How familiar are you with the professional degree programs in Public Administration offered by the various universities in Indiana? [check as indicated]" (Options were: "quite familiar," somewhat familiar," and "not familiar.")

TABLE THREE

WORKPLACE INTEREST IN CONTINUING GRADUATE P.A. EDUCATION AMONG PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS *

RESPONSE	GENDER		TENURE IN PUBLIC SERVICE	
	Male	Female	10 yr. or fwr.	m.t. 10 yr.
Most others	8.4%	3.8%	1.5%	10.2%
Some others	46.4	40.4	35.3	48.3
Very few	45.2	55.8	63.2	41.5
n=	(166)	(52)	(68)	(147)

* Responses to the item: "In general, do your colleagues share an interest in continuing graduate education in Public Administration? (Check as indicated)" [Options were "most others," "some others," and "very few."]

TABLE FOUR

PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF
SUBFIELDS OF KNOWLEDGE
WITHIN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION *

(Percentage of respondents saying very important)

Subfields	All Respondents N=240	Respondents with PA Education N=65	Respondents w/out PA Education N=167
Organizational behavior and interpersonal relations	82.0%	84.6%	80.2%
Budget operations and financial administration	77.0%	84.6%	74.1%
Personnel management	70.5%	70.8%	72.0%
Public Relations/ Communication	67.6%	65.6%	68.4%
Knowledge of political institutions and processes in state and local govt	67.0%	65.6%	68.4%
Management information systems and computer utilization	52.2%	58.5%	50.9%
Policy analysis	42.3%	49.2%	41.3%
Administrative law and legal issues	42.2%	47.7%	40.1%
Program evaluation research methodology	24.1%	36.1%	20.8%
Statistical analysis	16.8%	33.3%	11.4%

Responses to the survey item: "Listed below are some fields of knowledge that have been included in public administration degree programs. To what extent do you feel knowledge of each of these fields is necessary and important in your job as a public administrator? (Please circle the appropriate number)" [Options were "very important," "somewhat important," and "not important."]

TABLE FIVE

ADMINISTRATORS' VIEWS ABOUT
IMPORTANCE OF
POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT *
(Percentage saying very important)

Elements of Political Environment	All Respondents N = 240	Respondents with PA Ed N = 65	Respondents Without P.A. Education N = 173
Specific knowledge of current policy issues Education,....etc.).	70.0%	78.5%	66.3%
Position of interest groups on policy issue	44.7%	45.5%	44.8%
Legislative candidates and their views	42.5%	33.8%	45.1%
Public sector labor relations	34.1%	41.5%	32.2%
Minority groups and their views on policy issue	33.6%	43.1%	30.4%
General developments in the profession of public administration	30.9%	40.9%	26.9%
Election voting patterns	24.6%	15.2%	27.9%
Foreign affairs involving the USA	6.6%	10.8%	4.7%

* Response to survey item: In your role as an Indiana state/local public administrator, how important do you believe it is to keep in touch with the following? (Please circle appropriate number)" [Options were "very important," "somewhat important," and "not important."]

TABLE SIX
LEVEL OF INTEREST IN
SHORT WORKSHOPS IN
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION *

Workshop Title	Percent Saying Useful
Conflict resolving	53.0
Motivating and goal setting	50.4
Conducting effective meetings	50.0
Problem solving	49.6
Time management	49.6
Writing effective reports/ proposals	45.2
Effective team building	42.6
Listening skills	42.6
Presentation skills	40.4
Leadership styles	35.7
Stress management	31.3
Writing better letters and memos	31.3
Business English	29.6
Fair employment practices	22.6
Workshop on customer service	21.7
Assertiveness	17.0
Power strategies for women administrators	14.3
Power strategies for minority administrators	10.9

*Responses to survey item: "Listed below are some skills topics on which short courses and workshops are offered by public administration programs. Please circle one or more of the topics in which you think such seminars or workshops would be useful to state/local public administrators."

1. Acknowledgements

Well before it reaches its final state, a research project accumulates debts. The present authors would like to acknowledge and thank the following persons and personages who have been helpful--with particular attention to recent assistance.

A literal previous State for this research project was Kentucky. The mail questionnaire utilized in the survey was adapted from one used in a larger study done at Kentucky State University (NSF Grant No. RII87040-15). We are thankful to Dean Cassie Osborne, Professor Bruce Rose, Professor Don Woods and Dr. John Bugbee of the School of Public Affairs, Kentucky State University, for providing us with a copy of the initial research instruments.

In the present State: The Center for Governmental Studies at Indiana State University (a unit of the College of Arts and Sciences) provided institutional resources. Graduate students involved in an MPA course project at Indiana State (Jay Mitchell, David Seitz, Dale White, and Ken Coopwood) helped the first author draw the sample and prepare the mailing list. Other graduate students who have been involved in the project's operations are Stephen Kaminsi, Kaiying Wong, Debra Burger, and Rich Hardcastle. Mohammed Kassim performed extensive coding and data analysis (SPSS-X). Mary Richmond and Angie Givens of the Government Center have assisted with the myriad duties pertaining to the preparation of a manuscript, with particular attention to the presentation of graphics. Faculty members (other than those named as authors) who reviewed portions of the draft survey instrument included John Crittenden, Enamul Choudhury, and Laurellen Porter. Finally, we are thankful to Dr. Michael Erisman, Chair of the Political Science Department at ISU, for providing a supportive work environment for this study.

2.While only 6.6% of the respondents viewed "Foreign affairs involving USA" as important, some comments elaborated upon this theme. A minority of the MPA programs in the US currently offer a concentration on specialization in international/comparative administration and virtually none offer a required core course in this area.

REFERENCES

Abney, G. & T. Leuth (1982). "The Task of Administrators: Management and External Relations," American Review of Public Administration, Summer/Fall, pp. 171-184.

Becker, H. S. (1962). "The nature of a Profession," in N. B. Henry (Ed), Education for the Profession (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press), pp. 27-46.

Bowman, James (1990). "Ethics in Government: A National Survey of Public Administrators," Public Administration Review, vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 345-353.

Carson, Ron and Phil Roeder (1989). "Do State Government Administrators Need University Public Administration Programs?" paper presented at the annual meeting of the Kentucky chapter of ASPA, Lexington, Kentucky, 15 September.

Chauhan, D. S. (1981). "Education for Public Personnel Management," American Review of Public Administration, vol. 15 No. 2 Summer 1981, pp. 143-168.

Drew, Joseph (1984). "Marketing the MPA Degree," International Journal of Public Administration, vol. VI, June, pp. 151-181.

Grode, George, and Marc Holzer (1975). "The Perceived Utility of MPA Degrees," Public Administration Review, 35(4):403-412 (July/August).

Henry, Nicholas (1978). "The New MPA: Those Who Have It, Judge It," Midwest Review of Public Administration, 12(3):139-154 (September).

Mohapatra, M. K. et. al. (1990a). Managerial Training as a Correlate of Professional Development Among Public Managers in Kentucky State Government. Final Research Report submitted to National Science Foundation, August 1, 1990.

Mohapatra, M. K. et. al. (1990b). "Professional Socialization of State Administrators in Kentucky: An Empirical Study," a paper presented at the 51st annual meeting of the American Society for Public Administration, Los Angeles, April 7-11.

Mosher, Frederick (1982). Democracy and the Public Service, second edition (New York: Oxford University Press).

National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (1988). Standards for Professional Master's Degree Programs in Public Affairs and Administration, (Washington, D. C.: NASPAA).

Nigro, Lloyd and John Demarco (1979). "Training in Local Governments: Attitudes and Practices," Southern Review of Public Administration, vol. ___ No. __ March, pp. 475-489.